

Serial No. 09/728,257
Amdt. Dated September 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-22 were pending in the application. In this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of originally presented dependent claim 4, which is canceled, to more clearly distinguish the method of claim 1 from the art of record. Claim 8 is amended to make it dependent from claim 1 and more clearly claim features of the invention.

Independent claim 10 is amended to include the limitations of originally presented dependent claim 12, which is canceled, to further distinguish the method of claim 10 from the cited art.

Claims 15 and 17 are canceled.

Independent claim 19 is amended such that the claim is directed to computer readable medium having one or more computer readable program code devices not shown by the art of record. Specifically, the limitations of originally presented dependent claim 22 are added to claim 19, with claim 22 being canceled.

Claims 23 and 24 are added to provide protection for additional features of the method described in claim 1 that are not shown by the art of record.

No new matter is added by the claim amendments with support found at least in the original claims or by the addition of claims 23 and 24 with support found in the paragraph beginning at line 15 on page 12.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13, 14, 16, 18-21, 23, and 24 remain for consideration by the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the June 21, 2004 Office Action, claims 19-22 were rejected under §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. With this Amendment, claim 22 is canceled, and claims 19-21 are amended to address this rejection by directing the claims to a computer readable medium with program code devices.

Claim Objections

Additionally, in the Office Action, claim 19 was objected to based on an informality. Claim 19 is amended to address this informality (i.e., deletion of unnecessary phrase "the that").

Serial No. 09/728,257
Amdt. Dated September 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2004

response prior to transmittal to remove the identification information of the internal device and to replace it with URL information for a tunnel mechanism. The Office Action provides no citation in any of the references for either of these limitations. Additionally, as discussed previously, Applicant's could find no teaching in Bal, Newton, or Stein of hiding the internal device and certainly, not of providing URL information for a tunnel mechanism. For these reasons, this combination of references fails to support a rejection under §103(a), and Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection of claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 be withdrawn.

Additionally, the Office Action rejected claim 19 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bal in light of Newton and in view of Stein. As amended, claim 19 calls for computer readable program code devices configured to cause a computer to translate error messages in the received response and to take response actions to the error messages prior to sending a modified response. Bal, as discussed above with reference to claims 7 and 8, fails to teach or suggest correcting errors in a response, and Newton and Stein fail to overcome this deficiency of Bal. Hence, claim 19 is allowable over the combination of Bal, Newton, and Stein.

Conclusions

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

September 10, 2004



Kent A. Lembke, No. 44,866
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5378 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax